

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES

Date: March 6, 2014 **Time:** 24 minutes **Judge:** WILLIAM H. ORRICK
1:42 p.m. to 2:06 p.m.

Case No.: [13-cr-00764-WHO-1](#) **Case Name:** UNITED STATES v. Williams, et al.

Attorney for Plaintiff: William Frentzen and Damali Taylor
Attorney for Defendant: John Grele for Alfonzo Williams
Mark Goldrosen for Antonio Gilton
Tony Tamburello for Lupe Mercado and Esau Ferdinand
Richard Tamor and William Osterhoudt for Barry Gilton
Julia Jayne for Adrian Gordon
Josh Cohen and James Thomson for Reginald Elmore
Mark Vermeulen and David Andersen for Charles Heard
Joseph Rose for Paul Robeson
Severa Keith for Monzell Harding
(All defendants present and in custody)
Discovery Coordinator: Blair Perilman

Deputy Clerk: Jean Davis
Interpreter: n/a

Court Reporter: Belle Ball
Probation Office: n/a

PROCEEDINGS

Status conference conducted. Court inquires as to the status of the review by the Department of Justice and the status of discovery. The government submitted a memorandum and request for expedited review on February 21, 2014 as to three defendants: Lupe Mercado, Barry Gilton, and Antonio Gilton. Review is needed but has not yet been requested as to Alfonzo Williams. Two defendants have been joined since the last status conference: Charles Heard and Reginald Elmore. It is believed that these two parties will be subject to a slower review process which incorporates a defense mitigation submission. Review should not be necessary as to the remaining defendants.

The parties have been conferring as to an appropriate protective order. At this point, the parties have been unable to come to an agreement as to certain aspects of the protective order and would like to brief the issue for the Court. Briefing schedule agreed to by the parties, as follows:

Joint defense initial brief: April 3, 2014
Government responsive brief: April 17, 2014

Joint defense reply brief:
Hearing:

April 24, 2014
May 8, 2014 at 1:30 p.m.

The Court encouraged the parties to agree to a tighter briefing schedule after the status conference, if possible, so that discovery could be provided sooner. Parties discuss potential disagreements over the scope of redaction and necessity to protect the identities of individuals mentioned in the discovery--the Court will address those issues as necessary once discovery has been produced.

One party had indicated unwillingness to consent to exclusion of time at the status conference of 1/24/2014, but now all parties have stipulated to exclusion of time for effective preparation of counsel from that date to the next status conference. The government will submit the appropriate stipulation and order.

CASE CONTINUED TO: April 10, 2014 for further status conference at 1:30 p.m.

Any defendant who does not wish to attend this status conference may file a waiver of appearance.

EXCLUDABLE DELAY:

Category	Effective preparation of counsel
Begins	January 24, 2014
Ends	April 10, 2014
